

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 10 and 15 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 12 are currently being amended.

Claim 16 is currently being added.

This amendment amends, adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending, adding and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 1-9, 11-14 and 16 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0041077 to Lehner et al.; claims 4-6, 9, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehner in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0076224 to Braune; claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehner in view of Braune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,246 to Cofer; claims 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehner in view of Braune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,470 to Puchek et al.; and claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehner in view of Braune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,371 to Nichani et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claims 10 and 15 over the combination of Lehner and Braune and Nichani, whereby the features of claims 10 and 15 have now been respectively incorporated into presently pending independent claims 1 and 2, the Office Action asserts that Figure 10, column 22 and column 23, lines 1-10 of Nichani describes a process for monitoring only the mobile objects whose number is a predetermined value and which are selected in increasing

order of a distance from a dangerous source when the mobile objects whose number is more than the predetermined value intrude into a monitoring target region. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, column 10 of Nichani describes parameters that are used to computer optimal dimension for a protection zone in which an overhead camera is placed to protect a horizontal area beneath it. Column 22 of Nichani is concerned with positioning the camera such that intruders can be detected of all sizes, when they enter the protection zone. Accordingly, as described in column 23, lines 25-30 of Nichani, a viewing angle, perimeter placement and/or system response are determined to suit a particular region to be protected. As is clear from the above, Figure 10, column 23, and column 23, lines 1-10 of Nichani are not concerned at all with selecting a plurality of mobile objects in increasing order of a distance from a dangerous source when the mobile objects are in number more than a predetermined value in a monitoring target region. Rather, Nichani is concerned with the precise camera angle and protection zone size in order to detect a mobile object of a desired size range.

Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record makes up for the above-mentioned deficiencies of Nichani, presently pending independent claims 1 and 2 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Furthermore, in its rejection of claim 9, the Office Action asserts that paragraphs 0050 to 0053 of Lerner discloses a process for monitoring only the mobile objects existing in the warning region when the total number of the mobile objects existing in the warning region and the total number of mobile objects existing in the warning target region is more than a predetermined value. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, paragraph 0050 of Lerner describes a protection zone 7 within a detection region 6, in which upper tools 3 and lower tools 4 are located in the protection zone 7. Paragraph 0051 of Lerner discloses a warning zone 8 in addition to the protection zone 7. Paragraph 0052 of Lerner discloses an evaluation unit that determines whether an endangered object is located in the warning zone 8, and if so, a warning signal is output. Paragraph 0053 of Lerner discloses that an endangered object may correspond to the fingers or hands of an operator of the upper tools 3 and lower tools 4.

As is clear from the discussion above, paragraphs 0050 to 0053 of Lerner are concerned with outputting a warning signal when a single endangered object is located in a warning zone, and thus this portion of Lerner does not teach or suggest monitoring only the mobile objects existing in the warning region when the total number of the mobile objects

existing in the warning region and the total number of mobile objects existing in the warning target region is more than a predetermined value. To make this distinction more clear, claim 9 has been amended to recite that the predetermined value is greater than one, and that the total number of the mobile objects existing in the warning target region (and thus ignored from being monitored) is one or more.

Also, please note that only the mobile objects existing in the warning region are monitored, whereby any mobile objects existing in the warning target region are ignored. Such features are not taught or suggested by Lerner (which monitors all targets in a warning region and a warning target region) or by any of the other cited art of record.

Therefore, dependent claim 9 is patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for its base claim.

Still further, with respect to dependent claims 6 and 12, those claims have been amended to recite “continuously generating the warning until the mobile object which intruded into the warning region existing in the vicinity of the dangerous source moves out of the warning region, while for holding up the warning when at least one part of the mobile object is lost in sight in the warning region and has not been determined to have moved out of the warning region.” Paragraphs 0052 and 0053 of Lerner describe that a warning indicator is output when an endangered object is located in a warning zone, and an operator removes his/her hands (the “endangered object”) from the warning zone when the warning indicator is output, and whereby the warning indicator is stopped. This is clearly different from the features recited in claims 6 and 12, in which “at least one part of the mobile object is lost in sight in the warning region and has not been determined to have moved out of the warning region.” Accordingly, dependent claims 6 and 12 are patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

New Claim:

New claim 16 has been added to recite the following features (see page 26 of the specification):

monitoring the intruding object performed in the information processing apparatus comprises a process for allowing an audible and/or visual output of the warning which was held up when at least one part of the mobile object is lost in sight in the warning region, only after a manual resetting operation has been made.

Thus, unlike the general description of a reset operation as disclosed by Cofer in a security system, claim 16 recite only when a manual resetting operation has been made will an audible and/or visual output of a warning to be output, whereby that warning was stopped previously due to the mobile object being lost in sight in the warning region.

Therefore, new dependent claim 16 is patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for its base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 5, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819